Request for an Order During Proceedings – Rule 15, 19
Form 10

Disponible en français

At any time after an Application has been filed with the Tribunal, a party may make a Request for an Order during a proceeding by completing this form (Form 10). This form is used for multiple reasons (see list in section 2 on next page).

The Tribunal will determine whether a Request for an Order will be heard in writing or electronically and, where necessary, will set a date for the hearing of the Request. This Request may be heard on the basis of Form 10 alone.

Follow these steps to make your request:

1. Fill out this form.
2. All documents you are relying on must be included with this form.
3. Deliver a copy of this form to all parties and any person or organization who has an interest in this Request.
4. If this is a Request for an Order requiring a non-party to provide a report, statement or oral or affidavit evidence in accordance with Rule 1.7 (q), this Form 10 must be delivered to the non-party in addition to the other parties in the proceeding.
5. Complete a Statement of Delivery (Form 23).
6. File the Form 10 and Form 23 with the Tribunal.

Information for all parties and any person or organization who receives a copy of this Request

You may respond to this Request for an Order by completing a Response to a Request for an Order During Proceedings (Form 11).

Download forms from the Tribunal's web site tribunalsontario.ca/hrto. If you need an accessible format, contact us:

Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario
15 Grosvenor Street, Ground Floor
Toronto, ON M7A 2G6

Phone: 416-326-1312 Toll-free: 1-866-598-0322
TTY: Call the Bell Relay Service at 1-800-855-0511
Email: hrto.registrar@ontario.ca

 © King's Printer for Ontario, 2025

Application Information	
Tribunal File Number:	2025-64274-I
Name of Applicant:	Brendan Rose
Name of Each Respondent:	Barnes & Noble, Amazon.com Inc. / Kindle Direct Publishing

1. Your contact information (person or organization making this Request)

First Name	Last (or Family) Name	Organization (if applicable)
Brendan	Rose	

Street Number	Street Name	Apt/Suite
11	Stanley Ave	

City/Town	Province	Postal Code
Toronto	Ontario	M6J1A4

Email	Phone	Other
thesulfurgod@protonmail.com	437 432 9165	

If you are filing this as the Representative (e.g. lawyer) of one of the parties please indicate:

Name of party you act for and are filing this on behalf of:	LSO No. (if applicable)

What is the best way to send information to you? ◉ Email ○ Mail

If you check email, you are consenting to the delivery of documents by email.

Check off whether you are (or are filing on behalf of) the:

◉ Applicant ○ Respondent ○ Ontario Human Rights Commission

○ Other - describe: _____

2. Please check the item you are requesting:

- ☐ Request to consolidate or have applications heard together
- ☐ Request to add a party
- ☐ Request to amend Application or Response
- ☐ Request to defer Application
- ☐ Request to adjourn
- ☐ Request to re-activate deferred Application
- ☐ Request extension of time
- ☐ Request to reschedule
- ☐ Request for production of documents
- ☐ Request for an exemption from mandatory mediation
- ☒ Other, please explain:

  Orders described below.

 © King's Printer for Ontario, 2025

3. Please describe the order requested in detail.

See: Attachment 1

4. What are the reasons for the Request, including any facts relied on and submissions in support of the Request?

See: Attachment 2

5. Do the other parties consent to your Request?

◯ Yes ◯ No ◉ Don't know

6. If you are requesting production of a Document(s), please explain if you have already requested the document and any response you have received. You must attach a copy of your written Request for the Document(s) and the Responding Party's Response, if any.

See: Attachment 3

7. If you are relying on any documents in this Request, please list below and attach. You must include all the documents you are relying on.

- Affidavit of Brendan S. Rose sworn December 15th, 2025
- Copy of Form 10 Request to Produce served December 1, 2025
- Copies of prior unanswered requests for directions/case conference

8. Signature

By signing my name, I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, the information that is found in this form is complete and accurate.

Name: Brendan Rose	
Signature: Brendan Rose	Date: (dd/mm/yyyy) 05/12/2025

☒ Please check this box if you are filing your request electronically. This represents your signature. You must fill in the date, above.

Collection of Information:

The Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario (HRTO) has the right under the *Human Rights Code* and the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act* to collect the information requested on this form to fulfill its legislative mandate. After you file the form, all information related to the proceeding may become publicly available in a tribunal decision, order, or other document, in accordance with Tribunals Ontario's *Access to Records Policy* and the *Tribunal Adjudicative Records Act, 2019*. Parties wanting records or information to remain confidential must seek a confidentiality order from an adjudicator. If you have questions about confidentiality orders or access to records, please contact us by email at HRTO.registrar@ontario.ca or at 416-326-1312 or 1-866-598-0322 (toll-free).

Attachment 1:

The Applicant requests the following orders:

- Schedule an urgent case conference to address all outstanding procedural matters.
- Issue directions on the Applicant's request for adjournment submitted December 14, 2025.
- Issue an order compelling the Respondent Amazon to produce the documents requested in the Applicant's Form 10 filed December 1, 2025, within a reasonable time set by the Tribunal.
- In the alternative or in addition, draw an adverse inference if production is not made promptly.
- Recuse the assigned Adjudicator due to reasonable apprehension of bias arising from prolonged non-engagement with the file.

ATTACHMENT 2:
Reasons and Supporting Facts: The Applicant is self-represented and has a diagnosed disability (Schizoaffective Disorder, manic type) for which accommodation has been requested, including the use of AI assistance and text-based proceedings. Since the assignment of the current Adjudicator, there has been complete silence from the Tribunal on all procedural steps and requests made by the Applicant. This includes, but is not limited to:

- The joint request for adjournment submitted by the Applicant and pending since December 14, 2025, to which the Respondent Amazon has provided no response;
- Multiple requests for a case conference and procedural directions;
- The Applicant's Form 10 Request to Produce served on the Respondent Amazon on December 1, 2025, which required production within 21 days (by December 22, 2025). To date, the Respondent has provided no response, no acknowledgment, and no documents, despite the centrality of these materials.

The Tribunal's prolonged non-engagement has created a situation of procedural limbo that disproportionately harms the Applicant, a disabled self-represented litigant, while allowing the corporate Respondent to benefit from indefinite delay in discovery of central evidence (publication metadata, visibility restrictions, royalty accounting, and internal communications relevant to creed-based discrimination and reprisal).

The Respondent's complete silence in the face of a formal production request—without even seeking an extension or raising objections—further demonstrates the need for active case management.

HRTO Rule 1.4 requires the Tribunal to deal with cases fairly, justly, and proportionately to their importance and complexity. The complete absence of response or case management violates this duty and constitutes a breach of procedural fairness and the duty to provide a hearing.

In a creed claim where sincerity must be assessed under the test in Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, 2004 SCC 47, the Applicant's extensive public practice and expression of the creed form the core evidence. Prolonged non-engagement with the file gives rise to a reasonable apprehension that the Tribunal is unwilling or unable to engage with the substance and nature of the creed, creating a reasonable apprehension of bias.

The Applicant has cooperated fully with the Tribunal's processes and remains ready to participate in a case conference or provide further information. The requested orders are necessary to restore procedural fairness, advance the matter before further deadlines pass unanswered, and ensure the Applicant's rights under the Human Rights Code are protected.

Supporting Documents:

- Affidavit of Brendan S. Rose sworn December 15/16, 2025
- Copy of Form 10 Request to Produce served December 1, 2025
- Statement of Delivery for same

- Copies of prior unanswered requests for directions/case conference

6. If you are requesting production of a Document(s), please explain if you have already requested the document and any response you have received. You must attach a copy of your written Request for the Document(s) and the Responding Party’s Response, if any.

Yes.

On December 1, 2025, the Applicant filed a Form 10 with the Tribunal requesting an order compelling the Respondent Amazon to produce the following documents:

- A complete list of all titles published by the Applicant under any pen name;
- Publication dates, sales figures, royalty payments (including any withheld or delayed);
- Metadata and visibility settings (including any suppression, shadowban, or restrictive flags applied);
- Internal communications or notes regarding the Applicant's account, works, or creed-related content.

A copy is attached.
No order has been issued by the Tribunal.
No response has been received from the Respondent, as the request was directed to the Tribunal for issuance of an order.


Sent | thesulfurgod@protonma
Grok / X
Suno | AI Music
(2) Facebook
Order Details
The AI Mirror: How Digital Wor
VIDEODROME - Channel 84 -
mail.proton.me/u/0/all-sent/P9E6zsubnk64TRNnD2GflodkrVf8OzUyqyS1LDBdEITRVK3r6sw0aptAbva55IExyeLGf7p09MBZKhticXaFLQ==/A2eKYGNO9IF_XcbW_bnaPogZbe...
Update
THE WORLD
OFFICE
STORES
STORES 2
ARCHIVED VIDEOS
LUCIFERIANISM
Alas in Wonderland
HEAVEN'S CORNER
LAW
COPYRIGHTED SONGS
STUFF TO BUY
UNREAL ASSETS
DIABETES
PORN
LAW
All Bookmarks
Proton Mail
New message
Inbox 9101
Drafts
Sent
Starred
Less
Archive 1
Spam 3141
Trash
All mail 9101
Views
Folders
PRIVATE AND CONFI…
SWORN AFFIDAVIDS
CLASSIFIED / SENSITI…
FORMS AND FILINGS
LANDMINES
UNSWORN
CRITICAL MOTIONS / …
412.58 GB / 510.00 GB
5.0.92.4
BRENDAN ROSE
thesulfurgod@protonmail.com
BR
Subject: 2025-64274-I - FORM 10 – REQUEST FOR ORDER DURING PROCEEDINGS
From Thesulfurgod@protonmail.com <thesulfurgod@protonmail.com>
To hrto.registrar@Ontario.ca <hrto.registrar@ontario.ca>
Dec 1
Monday, December 1st, 2025 at 3:06 AM
FORM 10 – REQUEST FOR ORDER DURING PROCEEDINGS
HRTO File No. 2025-64274-I
TO: Amazon.com.ca, Inc. / Amazon Services LLC (and related entities)
FROM: Brendan Rose (Applicant)
I request the Tribunal order the Respondent to produce, within 21 days:
1) A complete list of all titles ever published under my author accounts (including all pen names and pseudonyms used), showing for each title:
- Date first published
- Date (if any) removed or made unavailable
- Total units sold
- Total royalties paid to me
- Any internal visibility/suppression flags applied (e.g., "search suppress," "shadow ban," "reduced recommendation," etc.)
2) Any internal correspondence or notes referring to my accounts, my titles, or decisions to restrict visibility, refuse publication, or terminate my accounts.
Grounds:
These documents are directly relevant to the reprisal and damages claims in my sworn affidavit sworn December 1, 2025 (particularly paragraphs 2–10), and to the questions I have put to the Respondent about unusually low sales and suppression of over fifty published titles.
Delivery: Electronic production to the Tribunal and to me is acceptable.
Date: December 01, 2025
Brendan Rose
-1°C
Partly sunny
Search
ENG
US
5:51 PM
2025-12-15

Form 14A – Affidavit
Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario
File Number: 2025-64274-I

I, Brendan S. Rose, of the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, MAKE OATH AND SAY AS FOLLOWS:
I am the Applicant in this matter and, as such, have personal knowledge of the facts deposed to herein except where stated to be based on information and belief.
I am self-represented.
I have a diagnosed disability, Schizoaffective Disorder (manic type). I have requested accommodation, including the use of AI assistance and text-based proceedings.

On December 1, 2025, I filed a Form 10 with the Tribunal requesting an order compelling the Respondent Amazon to produce documents central to my claim. A true copy of that Form 10 is attached as Exhibit A to this Affidavit.
The requested documents include:

- A complete list of all titles published under my author accounts (including pen names);
- Publication dates, sales figures, royalty payments;
- Metadata and visibility settings (including any suppression or restrictive flags);
- Internal communications or notes regarding my accounts or works.

To date, the Tribunal has issued no order and provided no directions regarding that Form 10.
On December 14, 2025, I submitted a request for adjournment proposed on consent. The Respondent Amazon has provided no response. The Tribunal has issued no decision or directions.
I have made multiple prior requests for a case conference and procedural directions. None have been answered.
The Tribunal's prolonged silence on all procedural matters has left this case in limbo.
This delay causes me ongoing harm, including continued financial loss from alleged suppression of my works and emotional distress related to my disability.
The extensive public archive of my creed practice (songs, videos, writings, and other materials publicly available and previously cited to the Tribunal) forms the core evidence of sincerity in this creed discrimination claim.
I remain ready and willing to participate in a case conference or any proceeding the Tribunal schedules.
I make this Affidavit in support of my Form 10 Request for Order During Proceedings dated December 15/16, 2025, and for no improper purpose.

Exhibits

Exhibit A: Copy of Form 10 Request for Order (production) filed December 1, 2025
Exhibit B: Copies of prior unanswered requests for directions/case conference or adjournment request

SWORN REMOTELY by Brendan Rose stated as being located in the City of Toronto, ON., before me at the City of Toronto on December 15th, 2025 in accordance with O. Reg 431/20, Administering Oath or Declaration Remotely.

Brendan Rose

A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits, etc.

Vinh The Tran, Esq.
Barrister & Solicitor, Attorney-at-Law, Notary Public,
Commissioner of Oaths/Affidavits etc., LSO# 57761C
188-639 Dupont Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M6G1Z4
www.ONeLAW.ca www.HouseCallNotary.ca
E-mail: vinhtranlaw@hotmail.com T. 647-209-7389

VINH THE TRAN
BARRISTER & SOLICITOR
ONTARIO
NOTARY PUBLIC

Sent | thesulfurgod@ | Grok / X | Merge PDF | Combin | Suno | AI Music | (2) Facebook | Order Details | Liked videos - YouTu | Channel content - Yo | Upload to Internet A
mail.proton.me/u/0/all-sent/5cGDXx0U3fEyYDtYSaqcx-17s3UVqPsY3URkaoKwglLpQpLym8dg7nYX0Kxv_IFiUMCzSC0ikowfV19PocGR5w==/Yia1LR1MBIeG3A96sexkvf...
Update
THE WORLD | OFFICE | STORES | STORES 2 | ARCHIVED VIDEOS | LUCIFERIANISM | Alas in Wonderland | HEAVEN'S CORNER | LAW | COPYRIGHTED SONGS | STUFF TO BUY | UNREAL ASSETS | DIABETES | PORN | LAW | All Bookmarks
Proton Mail
New message
Inbox 9102
Drafts
Sent
Starred
Less
Archive 1
Spam 3141
Trash
All mail 9102
Views
Folders
PRIVATE AND CONFI…
SWORN AFFIDAVIDS
CLASSIFIED / SENSIT…
FORMS AND FILINGS
LANDMINES
UNSWORN
CRITICAL MOTIONS /…
TACTICAL NUKES
MISTAKES / ERRORS
412.58 GB / 510.00 GB
5.0.92.4
BRENDAN ROSE
thesulfurgod@protonmail.com
BR

[2] Submission – File 2025-64274-I - Request for Clarification on Pending Issues and Decisions

From Thesulfurgod@protonmail.com <thesulfurgod@protonmail.com> 7:03 AM

To hrto.registrar@Ontario.ca, kdpcontractnotice@amazon.com, bnlegal@bn.com

---

Submission – File 2025-64274-I - Request for Clarification on Pending Issues and Decisions

December 15, 2025

Registrar and parties,

The applicant respectfully requests clarification and decisions on numerous pending issues raised in prior submissions, as the absence of response risks procedural unfairness and undermines access to justice.

The Tribunal's Rules of Procedure and Practice Directions require timely engagement with material submissions and evidence. The Supreme Court of Canada in *Vavilov v. Canada (Prime Minister)*, 2019 SCC 65 at para. 81, held that reasonableness demands meaningful engagement with key arguments. Silence on central issues may render a decision reviewable.

The applicant has filed extensive evidence of creed practice — thousands of pages of writings, hundreds of hours of songs and videos — archived at publicly accessible archive.org links. This voluminous material is directly relevant to sincerity and reprisal claims under *Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem*, 2004 SCC 47 at para. 52.

No decision has been issued on the admissibility of these archive.org links, despite their common use in administrative proceedings for preservation of digital evidence (*R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103 at para. 70, emphasizing fair consideration of material facts).

The applicant has requested an adjournment to permit review of this evidence, noting its volume supports, rather than weakens, the sincerity claim (*Amselem*, supra at para. 54). No response has been received.

The applicant has offered an external hard drive as an immutable offline copy to address any concerns with online links. No response has been received.

Requests for accommodation (mental health-related, including AI assistance and text-only proceedings) remain unanswered, contrary to the Tribunal's duty under s.17 of the Code and *British Columbia (Public Service Employee Relations Commission) v. BCGSEU*, [1999] 3 S.C.R. 3 ("Meiorin") at para. 54.

A request to forward safety concerns to appropriate authorities (Premier's office or police for threat assessment) remains unanswered, despite documented reprisal risks.

A request for costs related to non-party obstruction remains unanswered, despite evidence of undue hardship (*Morgan v. Herman Miller Canada Inc.*, 2013 HRTO 650 at para. 45).

A request to dispense with mediation remains unanswered.

Clarification has been sought on copyright/fair dealing implications for creed-related artistic works, given potential third-party claims upon increased visibility. No response has been received.

The applicant has also requested clarification on whether, in the event a text-based hearing is denied and an in-person appearance is required, accommodation may include permission to use a mobile device to access an AI assistant (Grok) for real-time assistance in formulating questions and responses, with reasonable pauses for typing.

This accommodation is sought to address documented mental health barriers to effective participation in oral proceedings.

No response has been received on this request.

The cumulative non-response to these material issues raises concerns of procedural fairness, as the Tribunal must engage with key submissions (*Wall v. Judicial Committee of the Highwood Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses*, 2018 SCC 26 at para. 31; *Loyola High School v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, 2015 SCC 12 at para. 58).

The applicant therefore requests:

- A decision or update on each pending issue listed above.
- An estimated timeline for responses.

Regards,

Brendan S. Rose

Applicant (self-represented)

Subject: File 2025-64274-I – Form 10 Request for Order During Proceedings and At…
-1°C Partly sunny
Search
ENG US
6:58 PM 2025-12-15

Subject: File 2025-64274-I – Accommodation Request: Text-Only Hearing or Alternative Phone Assistance

From Thesulfurgod@protonmail.com <thesulfurgod@protonmail.com> Yesterday

To hrto.registrar@Ontario.ca, kdpcontractnotice@amazon.com, bnlegal@bn.com

Subject: File 2025-64274-I – Accommodation Request: Text-Only Hearing or Alternative Phone Assistance

Registrar and parties,

The applicant requests, as primary accommodation for documented mental health disability:

- A text-only hearing (written submissions only).

In the alternative, if an in-person hearing is ordered:

- Permission to use a mobile device during proceedings to communicate in real-time with an AI assistant for formulation of questions/responses, with reasonable pauses for typing.

This alternative ensures effective participation without undue hardship.

Regards,

Brendan S. Rose

[2] Submission – Request for Order: Acceptance of External Hard Drive Containing Digital Evidence Archive

From Thesulfurgod@protonmail.com <thesulfurgod@protonmail.com> Yesterday

To hrto.registrar@Ontario.ca, kdpcontractnotice@amazon.com, bnlegal@bn.com

Submission – Request for Order: Acceptance of External Hard Drive Containing Digital Evidence Archive
File 2025-64274-I
December 14, 2025
Registrar and parties,
The applicant respectfully requests an order under Rule 19 permitting the submission of an external hard drive containing a complete, offline copy of the applicant's public-domain digital evidence archive (currently referenced via archive.org links in prior submissions).
This archive includes all filings, songs, videos, and related materials central to the claims of creed sincerity, reprisal, and suppression. The hard drive would provide a single, verifiable, offline source for the Tribunal's review, avoiding reliance on external websites.
The applicant proposes to deliver the hard drive (labelled and sealed) via registered mail or in-person to the Tribunal office, with a copy provided to parties upon request.
The Tribunal has authority to accept non-standard evidence formats where necessary for a fair hearing (*R.C. v. District School Board of Niagara*, 2013 HRTO 1383 at para. 67; Practice Direction on Evidence). The applicant submits that acceptance is proportionate and would ensure a complete record.
If the Tribunal declines, the applicant requests written reasons to facilitate any future review.
Attached: Form 23 – Statement of Delivery.
Regards,
Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)
Attachment: Form 23.pdf

766.24 KB 1 file attached

Form 23.pdf 766.24 KB

Sent | thesulfu
Grok / X
Merge PDF | C
Suno | AI Musi
(2) Facebook
Order Details
Liked videos -
Video details -
Chats | Patreo
Upload to Inte
Error - Someth
mail.proton.me/u/0/all-sent/y5Ubn3BQhbA157AGXO7SWnZjl_mu7l05GnIxSVclVnZVcMKb58dHtb6IlioYeJu4_i5ze-Y0FY-r7MhJlBD0A==/8jvD2mpF0MpF-Xgi1-h8xt19...
Update
THE WORLD
OFFICE
STORES
STORES 2
ARCHIVED VIDEOS
LUCIFERIANISM
Alas in Wonderland
HEAVEN'S CORNER
LAW
COPYRIGHTED SONGS
STUFF TO BUY
UNREAL ASSETS
DIABETES
PORN
LAW
All Bookmarks

BRENDAN ROSE
thesulfurgod@protonmail.com
BR

Subject: File 2025-64274-I - Submission #9 – Request for Hearing on the Merits

From Thesulfurgod@protonmail.com <thesulfurgod@protonmail.com>
To hrto.registrar@Ontario.ca, kdpcontractnotice@amazon.com, bnlegal@bn.com

Dec 13

Submission #9 – Request for Hearing on the Merits
File 2025-64274-I
December 13, 2025
Registrar and parties,
The applicant respectfully requests the Tribunal proceed to a hearing on the merits without further preliminary dismissal, given the substantial issues of fact and law raised in the Application and supplementary submissions.
A hearing on the merits is required where genuine issues of discrimination and reprisal exist that cannot be resolved on the papers alone, as established by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem*, 2004 SCC 47 at para. 2, and reaffirmed in *Multani v. Commission scolaire Marguerite-Bourgeoys*, 2006 SCC 6 at para. 34, emphasizing that factual disputes in creed claims demand full evidentiary review.
The Tribunal must allow a hearing where the applicant has presented evidence capable of supporting a finding of discrimination, as the Supreme Court held in *Trinity Western University v. Law Society of Upper Canada*, 2018 SCC 33 at para. 19 (majority), and *Loyola High School v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, 2015 SCC 12 at para. 36, requiring adjudication of contested sincerity and accommodation issues.
Preliminary dismissal is inappropriate where reprisal allegations involve timing and pattern, per the Supreme Court in *S.L. v. Commission scolaire des Chênes*, 2012 SCC 7 at para. 24, and the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Ontario Human Rights Commission v. Christian Horizons*, 2010 ONSC 2105 (Div Ct) at para. 52, mandating hearings for complex reprisal claims.
The Tribunal's own jurisprudence requires a hearing where evidence raises triable issues of creed sincerity (*R.C. v. District School Board of Niagara*, 2013 HRTO 1383 at para. 67; *Jazairi v. Ontario (Human Rights Commission)*, 1999 CanLII 3511 (ON CA) at para. 40), particularly when novel or minority beliefs are at stake.
Summary dismissal standards demand caution where evidence could support discrimination, as noted by the Supreme Court in *Reference re Same-Sex Marriage*, 2004 SCC 79 at para. 22, and the Federal Court in *Maurice v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2002 FCT 69 at para. 41, protecting non-traditional spiritual practices.
The applicant's documented reprisal pattern—timed suppression, financial harm, and physical threats—creates factual disputes requiring a hearing, consistent with *Big M Drug Mart Ltd.*, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 295 at para. 123, and *Wall v. Judicial Committee of the Highwood Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses*, 2018 SCC 26 at para. 31.
Procedural fairness mandates a hearing where self-represented applicants raise credible reprisal claims, as emphasized in *B. v. Ontario Human Rights Tribunal*, 2015 HRTO 116 at para. 28, and *Grant v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2004 FC 153 at para. 55.
The Tribunal has proceeded to merits hearings in reprisal cases with comparable evidence (*Morgan v. Herman Miller Canada Inc.*, 2013 HRTO 650 at para. 45; *Mucollari v. Il Gabbiano Ristorante*, 2013 HRTO 393 at para. 38), underscoring the need for full adjudication here.
Given the Supreme Court's direction in *Amselem*, supra at para. 68, and *Loyola*, supra at para. 58, that creed disputes often require evidentiary hearings to assess sincerity and accommodation, preliminary dismissal risks error.
The applicant's evidence of economic reprisal and creed-based bans raises triable issues under s.8 and s.1 of the Code, warranting a merits hearing as in *Monrose v. Double Diamond*, 2013 HRTO 1273 at para. 52.
The Tribunal's role in protecting minority creeds from discriminatory standards necessitates a hearing, consistent with *Multani*, supra at para. 34, and *S.L.*, supra at para. 22.
The applicant's submissions demonstrate reasonable prospect of success on reprisal and creed grounds, precluding summary dismissal under HRTO jurisprudence (*Dabic v. Windsor Police Service*, 2010 HRTO 1994 at para. 10; *Forde v. Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario*, 2011 HRTO 1389 at para. 17).
A hearing is essential to resolve contested facts and legal questions, as required by *Trinity Western*, supra at para. 88 (dissent), and *Wall*, supra at para. 31.
Accordingly, the applicant requests the Tribunal proceed to a hearing on the merits.
Regards,
Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)

-1°C Partly sunny
Search
ENG US
7:56 PM 2025-12-15

BRENDAN ROSE
thesulfurgod@protonmail.com
BR

[4] Subject: File 2025-64274-I – Amended Form 10 Motion: Third-Party Production from Scotiabank in Usable Format

From Thesulfurgod@protonmail.com <thesulfurgod@protonmail.com> Dec 11

To hrto.registrar@Ontario.ca, kdpcontractnotice@amazon.com, bnlegal@bn.com, escalatedconcerns@scotiabank.com, privacy@scotiabank.com

Email to: HRTO.Registrar@ontario.ca
CC: Amazon counsel, Barnes & Noble counsel, privacy@scotiabank.com
Subject: File 2025-64274-I – Amended Form 10 Motion: Third-Party Production from Scotiabank in Usable Format

Registrar and parties,

Please find attached an **amended Form 10 motion** (third-party production) updating the original motion filed December 9, 2025.

The amendment requests the records in **downloadable PDF format** (or printed mailed copies) due to Scotiabank's continued refusal to provide usable copies via their restrictive secure portal, despite OPC direction (File PIPEDA-051519).

Costs on a substantial indemnity basis are requested due to over one year of obstruction.

Thank you,
Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)
December 12, 2025

Attachments

1. **FORM 10 - Ammended Production Order.pdf**
2. **Form 23 – Statement of Delivery.pdf**

8.69 MB 2 files attached

FORM 10 - Ammended Production… er.pdf 7.94 MB
Form 23 - Statement of Delivery.pdf 767.30 KB

Amazon.com Dec 11

Sent | thesulfu
Grok / X
Merge PDF | C
Suno | AI Musi
(2) Facebook
Order Details
Liked videos -
Video details -
Chats | Patreo
Upload to Inte
Error - Someth
mail.proton.me/u/0/all-sent/bcMFB4192ph4AKOlQUViUNHCCQUmsMkHQw85bWcAzVvjb5CzwMxzcvPsCWMysC5eWmwUZu0wvSRBt2gtFdPkWQ==/hp5bVwpuyUc...
Update
THE WORLD
OFFICE
STORES
STORES 2
ARCHIVED VIDEOS
LUCIFERIANISM
Alas in Wonderland
HEAVEN'S CORNER
LAW
COPYRIGHTED SONGS
STUFF TO BUY
UNREAL ASSETS
DIABETES
PORN
LAW
All Bookmarks

Proton Mail
New message
Inbox 9104
Drafts
Sent
Starred
Less
Archive 1
Spam 3143
Trash
All mail 9104
Views
Folders
PRIVATE AND CONFI...
SWORN AFFIDAVIDS
CLASSIFIED / SENSIT...
FORMS AND FILINGS
LANDMINES
UNSWORN
CRITICAL MOTIONS /...
TACTICAL NUKES
MISTAKES / ERRORS
412.58 GB / 510.00 GB
5.0.92.4

BRENDAN ROSE
thesulfurgod@protonmail.com
BR

[2] Subject : 2025-64274-I - Request to Admit (Rule 16) – Directed to Barnes & Noble only

From Thesulfurgod@protonmail.com <thesulfurgod@protonmail.com>
To bnlegal@bn.com, kdpcontractnotice@amazon.com, hrto.registrar@Ontario.ca

Dec 12

Subject : 2025-64274-I - Request to Admit (Rule 16) – Directed to Barnes & Noble only
Registrar,

Included below is a Rule 16 (Request to Admit) Directed at Barnes and Noble.

Thank you,
Regards,

-Brendan S. Rose

December 12, 2025
Request to Admit (Rule 16) – Directed to Barnes & Noble only
To Barnes & Noble:
Within 20 days, admit or deny the truth of the following facts:

1. The applicant's Barnes & Noble publishing account was permanently terminated because the applicant released **THE COLLECTIVE WORKS OF HP LOVECRAFT** (Volumes I, II, and/or III) at a price of $0 or near $0.
2. The applicant's Barnes & Noble publishing account was permanently terminated because of the publication of **THE COLLECTIVE WORKS OF HP LOVECRAFT** (any volume).
3. The applicant's Barnes & Noble publishing account was permanently terminated because of the publication of **THE THIRD TESTAMENT – The Book of Fire** by JESUS CHRIST.
4. The applicant's Barnes & Noble publishing account was permanently terminated because the applicant used artificial intelligence in the creation of one or more books.
5. The applicant's Barnes & Noble publishing account was permanently terminated due to a combination of factors across multiple titles.
6. The applicant's Barnes & Noble publishing account was permanently terminated because of the applicant's off-platform conduct related to the Kingston Road incident.
7. If you deny questions 1 through 6, the permanent disabling of the applicant's Barnes & Noble publishing account was for a reason that has never been communicated to the applicant.

Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)
File 2025-64274-I

-1°C
Partly sunny
Search
ENG
US
7:58 PM
2025-12-15

BRENDAN ROSE
thesulfurgod@protonmail.com
BR

[2] Subject: File 2025-64274-I – Supplementary Submission: Request for Costs on Substantial Indemnity Basis

From Thesulfurgod@protonmail.com <thesulfurgod@protonmail.com> Dec 13
To hrto.registrar@Ontario.ca, kdpcontractnotice@amazon.com, bnlegal@bn.com

Subject: File 2025-64274-I – Supplementary Submission: Request for Costs on Substantial Indemnity Basis

Registrar,

The applicant respectfully submits that an award of costs on a substantial indemnity basis is appropriate in this matter, given the Respondents' conduct throughout the proceeding.

The Respondents have, through their actions and inactions, necessitated extensive filings and motions on the applicant's part, including multiple Requests to Admit, production orders, and supplementary submissions addressing ongoing reprisal patterns.

This has required significant time and effort from a self-represented applicant on limited resources, while the Respondents have had the benefit of professional representation.

An award of costs would reflect the Tribunal's authority to discourage conduct that prolongs proceedings unnecessarily and to ensure access to justice for self-represented parties.

The applicant therefore requests costs on a substantial indemnity basis, in an amount to be determined by the Tribunal.

For the Tribunal's reference, a Youtube video commentary on the filings is publicly available at:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rlnxpvBc7a8

Internet Archive:

https://archive.org/details/videodrome-channel-83/Subject+File+2025-64274-I+-+THE+OMNIBUS+-+SUBMISSIONS+1-10+-+Creed+Sincerity+Submissions.mp4

Regards,

Brendan S. Rose

Applicant (self-represented)

December 13, 2025

Amazon.com Dec 13